

Spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation

A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath

Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences,
University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom

Abstract

In recent papers, we have studied the quantum-mechanical decay of a Schwarzschild-like black hole, formed by gravitational collapse, into almost-flat space-time and weak radiation at a very late time. In this recent work, we have been concerned with evaluating quantum amplitudes (not just probabilities) for transitions from initial to final states. In a general asymptotically-flat context, one may specify a quantum amplitude by posing boundary data on (say) an initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I and a final space-like hypersurface Σ_F . To complete the specification, one must also give the Lorentzian proper-time interval between the two boundary surfaces, as measured near spatial infinity. We have assumed that the Lagrangian contains Einstein gravity coupled to a massless scalar field ϕ , plus possible additional fields; there is taken to be a 'background' spherically-symmetric solution $(\gamma_{\mu\nu}, \Phi)$ of the classical Einstein/scalar field equations. For bosonic fields, the gravitational and scalar boundary data can be taken to be g_{ij} and ϕ on the two hypersurfaces, where g_{ij} ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$) gives the intrinsic 3-metric on the boundary, and the 4-metric is $g_{\mu\nu}$ ($\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$), the boundary being taken locally in the form $\{x^0 = \text{const.}\}$. The classical boundary-value problem, corresponding to the calculation of this quantum amplitude, is badly posed, being a boundary-value problem for a wave-like (hyperbolic) set of equations. Following Feynman's $+i\epsilon$ prescription, one makes the problem well-posed by rotating the asymptotic time-interval T into the complex: $T \rightarrow |T| \exp(-i\theta)$, with $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. After calculating the amplitude for $\theta > 0$, one then takes the 'Lorentzian limit' $\theta \rightarrow 0_+$. Such quantum amplitudes have been calculated for weak $s = 0$ (scalar), $s = 1$ (photon) and $s = 2$ (graviton) anisotropic final data, propagating on the approximately Vaidya-like background geometry, in the region containing radially-outgoing black-hole radiation. In this paper, we treat quantum amplitudes for the case of fermionic massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ (neutrino) final boundary data. Making use of boundary conditions originally developed for local supersymmetry, we find that this fermionic case can be treated in a way which parallels the bosonic case. In particular, we calculate the classical action as a functional of the fermionic data on the late-time surface Σ_F ; the quantum amplitude follows straightforwardly from this.

1. Introduction

This paper treats quantum amplitudes involving neutrinos ($s = \frac{1}{2}$) in the context of nearly-spherical Einstein/massless-scalar gravitational collapse to a black hole, following the approach of [1-9]. We first summarise the main ideas at the bosonic level. Writing $g_{\mu\nu}$ ($\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$) for the 4-metric and $h_{ij} = g_{ij}$ ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$) for the intrinsic Riemannian spatial 3-metric on a surface $\{x^0 = \text{const.}\}$, one poses appropriate boundary data $(h_{ij}, \phi)_{I,F}$ (say) on an initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I at $x^0 = 0$ and on a final surface

Σ_F . For simplicity, we assume that both Σ_I and Σ_F are diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$. The large (real) Lorentzian time-separation T between the surfaces is measured at spatial infinity. Again, for simplicity, the initial data $(h_{ij}, \phi)_I$ are taken to be exactly spherically symmetric, corresponding to a diffuse, slowly-moving, initially-spherical configuration. The space-time geometry near the final surface Σ_F is taken to be approximately a Vaidya metric [4,5], describing the region which contains radially-outgoing radiation due to the collapse to a black hole, except for small perturbations in the gravitational and scalar data.

We assume that there is a 'background' Lorentzian-signature spherically-symmetric solution of the coupled field equations, with 4-metric $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ and scalar field Φ . If the data for the gravitational and scalar fields are perturbed slightly from spherical symmetry, the resulting non-spherically-symmetric solution can be written in the form

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \gamma_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon h_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} + \epsilon^2 h_{\mu\nu}^{(2)} + \dots, \quad \phi = \Phi + \epsilon \phi^{(1)} + \epsilon^2 \phi^{(2)} + \dots, \quad (1.1)$$

where ϵ is a measure of the size of the perturbation. We then ask (in this bosonic case) for the quantum amplitude to go from asymptotically-flat initial data $(g_{ij}, \phi)_I$ on the initial hypersurface Σ_I to corresponding final data $(g_{ij}, \phi)_F$ on the final hypersurface Σ_F . For a complete specification of the boundary data involved in the quantum amplitude, one also needs the (Lorentzian) time interval T between Σ_I and Σ_F , as measured at spatial infinity.

Naively, one might expect there to be a simple (semi-)classical analogue of this quantum amplitude, as specified by the above boundary data. This would involve finding a classical solution of the coupled Einstein/scalar field equations, which agrees with the boundary data, and such that the Lorentzian proper-time separation at spatial infinity is indeed T . Unfortunately, this will only be possible for very special choices of boundary data, having measure zero among all possible boundary data. Equivalently, as is well known [2,10,11], the boundary-value problem for hyperbolic (wave-like) partial differential equations is not well posed.

The procedure for understanding our (Lorentzian) quantum amplitude semi-classically is a little more complicated. Following Feynman's $+i\epsilon$ proposal [12], we rotate the Lorentzian time-interval T into the complex: $T \rightarrow |T| \exp(-i\theta)$, with $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. In the extreme case $\theta = \pi/2$, the Riemannian region with positive-definite 4-metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is reached. In the Riemannian case, the field equations are 'elliptic *modulo* gauge', and one might reasonably expect good existence, uniqueness and analyticity properties for classical solutions, under suitable conditions on the boundary data. In the intermediate complex case, with $0 < \theta < \pi/2$, the interval T and any classical solution will involve the complex numbers non-trivially. In such 'complexified elliptic' cases, it frequently turns out that the boundary-value problem is *strongly elliptic*, up to gauge, as defined and discussed in [13]. Strongly elliptic partial differential equations are again liable, as in the real elliptic case, to have good existence, uniqueness and analyticity properties [13]. There is reasonable ground for expecting that our classical boundary-value problem will have an (analytic) complex solution, for $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$, at least under suitable conditions on the boundary data.

One can then form the (complex) classical action S_{class} , for the given real boundary data [here (g_{ij}, ϕ)], as a function of θ . Similarly, provided that the quantum field theory

under consideration has meaningful quantum amplitudes (see below), there will be one-loop, two-loop, $\dots$ factors $A_0, A_1, A_2, \dots$, again depending on the boundary data and on θ . That is, the quantum amplitude will have an asymptotic semi-classical expansion of the form

$$\text{Amplitude} \sim (A_0 + \hbar A_1 + \hbar^2 A_2 + \dots) \exp(iS_{\text{class}}/\hbar) \quad (1.2)$$

Provided that the frequencies involved in the prescribed boundary data are well below the Planck scale, one expects to be able to approximate the quantum amplitude by $(\text{const.}) \times \exp(iS_{\text{class}})$, in units such that $\hbar = 1$. For dimensional reasons, any loop corrections will then be extremely small, compared with the leading term $A_0 \exp(iS_{\text{class}})$. Finally, one recovers the Lorentzian quantum amplitude, which is defined to be the limit as $\theta \rightarrow 0_+$ of the θ -dependent quantum amplitude. Provided that one is away from the Planck scale, then it is sufficient to compute $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0_+} \exp(iS_{\text{class}})$.

The only field theories which can give meaningful quantum amplitudes in our case, with the property (1.2), are locally supersymmetric, that is, supergravity theories with or without supermatter [11,14-16]. The simplest theory of $N = 1$ supergravity coupled to supermatter, which contains Einstein/massless-scalar theory within its bosonic part, is given in [17]. For this theory, the scalar field has become complex, with massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ partner, and of course there is also a spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ gravitino. It should be understood that, in the discussion above concerning quantum amplitudes for purely bosonic boundary data, the quantum amplitudes refer in fact to the full locally-supersymmetric theory.

It is then natural to ask for quantum amplitudes involving boundary data which include non-trivial spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ or spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ contributions. In this paper, we shall compute the amplitude for non-zero spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ data given on Σ_F , assuming that the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ data on Σ_I are zero. In particle language, this would refer to the production of neutrino-antineutrino pairs. The resulting classical fermionic fields and action will then be elements of a Grassmann algebra, as usual in the holomorphic representation for fermions [11,18-20]. (In Lorentzian signature, this point of view has also been taken in [21], concerning the Cauchy problem for $N = 1$ supergravity.) In the present paper, the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ field is described in terms of 2-component spinor fields [22,23], the unprimed spinor field $\phi^A(x)$ and the independent primed spinor field $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}(x)$, not related to $\phi^A(x)$ by any conjugation operator. The fields $\phi^A(x)$ and $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}(x)$ are taken to be odd (anti-commuting) elements of a Grassmann algebra [18-20] – see Sec.2 below. As discussed further in Sec.3, this is the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ description appropriate to Euclidean signature (Riemannian geometry), and it is also the description appropriate to the 'Riemannian rotated-into-the-complex' case here, with $0 < \theta < \pi/2$, and corresponding to a well-posed classical boundary-value formulation. The fermionic action (3.1) below is quadratic in spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fields or their derivatives, and so is an even element of the Grassmann algebra. This gives a 'field description' for the massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ theory in our case, which allows a treatment of the fermionic quantum amplitude which is roughly in parallel with the previous treatments for bosonic fields [5,6,8,9]. The holomorphic representation being used here for fermions can straightforwardly be related to a (possibly more familiar) description in terms of particle states, as is outlined in Sec.2.

The basic fields and the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ action are discussed in Sec.3. The action has the form $S_{\frac{1}{2}} = S_{\frac{1}{2}V} + S_{\frac{1}{2}B}$, where $S_{\frac{1}{2}V}$ is the standard volume expression, and $S_{\frac{1}{2}B}$ is a boundary

contribution, which depends on the particular boundary conditions being adopted. Natural local boundary conditions are taken, related to local supersymmetry [24-26]. These again allow a parallel between our $s = \frac{1}{2}$ treatment and that for other (bosonic) spins. At a solution of the classical massless $s = \frac{1}{2}$ field equations (Weyl equations), the volume contribution $S_{\frac{1}{2}V}$ vanishes, whence $S_{\frac{1}{2}\text{class}} = S_{\frac{1}{2}B\text{class}}$.

Some basic properties of the Vaidya space-time are summarised in Sec.4. After the initial gravitational collapse, a large part of the classical Einstein/massless-scalar space-time can be approximated by a metric of Vaidya type [4,7,27], with its mass decreasing extremely slowly with time. This describes the region of the space-time containing the emitted radiation. Almost all the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ (or other spin) modes of physical interest will evolve adiabatically in this background.

In Sec.5, we review the separation of variables for massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fields in a Schwarzschild-like background. This leads to a treatment of the classical action $S_{\frac{1}{2}B\text{class}}$ in which local boundary data are specified on the final surface Σ_F , given, for simplicity (as above), that trivial fermionic data are taken on Σ_I . The form of the resulting classical action, as a functional of the final boundary data, is compared with that for massless spin-0 perturbations, found in [5,6]. The form of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Lorentzian quantum amplitude can then be deduced straightforwardly from the definition $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \exp(iS_{\text{class}})$. A brief conclusion is contained in Sec.6.

2. Holomorphic representation for fermions

Suppose, at first, that one had a Fermi system with only one degree of freedom [18,19], rather than a quantum field theory. In the holomorphic representation [18-20], one would begin by considering two variables a^* and a , which are odd (anti-commuting) elements of a Grassmann algebra:

$$a^*a + aa^* = 0; \quad (a^*)^2 = 0; \quad a^2 = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

A typical element of the resulting Grassmann algebra (over the complex numbers) has the form

$$f(a^*, a) = f_{00} + f_{01}a + f_{10}a^* + f_{11}aa^*, \quad (2.2)$$

where f_{00}, f_{01}, f_{10} and f_{11} are complex numbers. Functions of the form

$$f(a^*) = f_0 + f_1a^*, \quad (2.3)$$

with f_0 and f_1 being complex numbers, are called *holomorphic functions*; these describe the state vectors of the system and form a two-dimensional space.

The operators $\mathbf{a}^*$ and $\mathbf{a}$, acting on state vectors given in the form (2.3), are defined by

$$\mathbf{a}^*(f(a^*)) = a^*f(a^*); \quad \mathbf{a}(f(a^*)) = \frac{d}{da^*}f(a^*), \quad (2.4)$$

where fermionic differentiation is defined by

$$\frac{d}{da^*}(f_0 + f_1a^*) = f_1. \quad (2.5)$$

Then, one can verify the standard anti-commutation relations

$$\mathbf{a}^* \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^* = 1; \quad (\mathbf{a}^*)^2 = 0; \quad (\mathbf{a})^2 = 0 \quad . \quad (2.6)$$

Berezin integration [18-20,28] is defined through the rules

$$\int a^* da^* = 1; \quad \int a da = 1; \quad \int da^* = 0; \quad \int da = 0 \quad . \quad (2.7)$$

The inner product of two state vectors is defined to be

$$(f_1, f_2) = \int (f_1(a^*))^* f_2(a^*) e^{-a^* a} da^* da \quad , \quad (2.8)$$

This inner product is positive-definite. Indeed, the monomials

$$\psi_0 = 1; \quad \psi_1 = a^* \quad (2.9)$$

are an orthogonal pair, each of unit length. One may interpret ψ_0 as giving a no-particle state and ψ_1 as giving a one-particle state; similarly, the operators $\mathbf{a}^*$ and $\mathbf{a}$ give creation and annihilation operators. In this way, one can replicate the usual structures familiar in a particle description of fermions. But, in the holomorphic representation for fermions, the wave functions are encoded through the 'complex-analytic' form $f(a^*) = f_0 + f_1 a^*$, which makes the parallel with bosonic systems much closer; in the holomorphic representation for bosons [18-20], wave-functions take the form $f(a^*)$, where, in the bosonic context, a^* is simply a (commuting) complex variable.

This representation can be generalised to fermionic field theory [18,19], by considering a collection of Fermi oscillators interacting with an external field. In our case (see below), we fix half of the spinorial quantities $(\phi^A(x), \tilde{\phi}^{A'}(x))$ at each point x on Σ_I , and similarly half at each point on Σ_F , in order to have a well-posed classical boundary-value problem for the massless Dirac (Weyl) equation. This amounts to choosing an initial (and a final) wave-functional, which is a product of delta-functions in the fermionic variables. In the simple Fermi example of Eqs.(2.1-9), one has (for example) $\delta(a^*) = a^*$. That is, in our case, the wave-functionals specifying the initial and final data are (formally) products, over all points x , of suitable functions of the type (2.3). This holomorphic approach for fermions, of course, exploits the connection between the quantum and the classical. Similarly for bosonic fields, where the Bargmann-Fock holomorphic representation is known as the theory of coherent states in quantum optics [18-20,28].

3. Massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fields

We are concerned with the quantum amplitude to go from initial data specified on an initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I , at time $t = 0$ (say), measured at spatial infinity, to final data on a hypersurface Σ_F , at a very late Lorentzian proper time T , again measured at spatial infinity. As described in Sec.1, we rotate the time-interval T into the complex: $T \rightarrow |T| \exp(-i\theta)$, where $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. In this case, the *classical* boundary-value problem is

expected to be strongly elliptic, up to gauge, leading to a complex classical solution $(g_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ for Einstein/scalar theory. From this, one can recover the Lorentzian quantum amplitude *via* Feynman's $+i\epsilon$ procedure, by considering the semi-classical amplitude in the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0_+$. As mentioned above, the Lorentzian-signature boundary-value problem ($\theta = 0$) is badly posed [2,10,11], even for linear systems of equations – in general, there is no solution, or, if there is a solution, it may not be unique. It is for this reason that calculations in quantum field theory (along the lines just given) must proceed in the 'Euclidean direction', that is, by taking $\text{Im}(T) < 0$.

For quantum purposes, then, we should think of the massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ field from the Euclidean viewpoint. In the simplest case, one has an unprimed 2-component spinor field ϕ^A and an independent primed spinor field $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}$ [11] (this reference describes the spinor conventions being used here). In addition to the familiar Einstein/massless-scalar action of Eq.(3.4) of [5], possibly including also a Maxwell contribution as in Eq.(2.1) of [8], the (Lorentzian) action S now contains an extra piece

$$S_{\frac{1}{2}} = -\frac{i}{2} \int d^4x \, e \, \tilde{\phi}^{A'} e_{AA'}{}^\mu (D_\mu \phi^A) + \text{'h.c.'} + S_{\frac{1}{2}B} . \quad (3.1)$$

Here, as in Sec.6 of [8], $e_{AA'}{}^\mu$ denotes the spinor form of the tetrad $e_a{}^\mu$ ($a = 0, 1, 2, 3$), and we define $e = \det(e_a{}^\mu) = (-g)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $g = \det(g_{\mu\nu})$. The spinor-valued connection one-forms $\omega^{AB}{}_\mu = \omega^{(AB)}{}_\mu$ and their tilded counterparts $\tilde{\omega}^{A'B'}{}_\mu = \tilde{\omega}^{(A'B')}{}_\mu$ are defined in Sec.2.9.2 of [11]. The covariant derivative on spinors is defined, with the help of the distributive law, *via*

$$D_\mu \phi^A = \partial_\mu \phi^A + \omega^A{}_{B\mu} \phi^B , \quad (3.2)$$

$$D_\mu \tilde{\phi}^{A'} = \partial_\mu \tilde{\phi}^{A'} + \tilde{\omega}^{A'}{}_{B'\mu} \tilde{\phi}^{B'} , \quad (3.3)$$

Also, the expression 'h.c.' in Eq.(3.1) denotes an operation in which ϕ^A is replaced by $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}$, and $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}$ by ϕ^A , and in which the order of fermionic integrands is reversed. This is necessary, since fermionic quantities such as ϕ^A or $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}$ must be taken to be odd elements of a Grassmann algebra, anti-commuting among each other (obeying, for example, $\phi^A \tilde{\phi}^{A'} = -\tilde{\phi}^{A'} \phi^A$), as in Sec.2. The final element of Eq.(3.1) is a boundary contribution $S_{\frac{1}{2}B}$, which depends on the fermionic boundary conditions chosen (see below).

On varying the independent quantities $\phi^A, \tilde{\phi}^{A'}$ in the action (3.1), one obtains the Weyl (neutrino) field equations

$$e_{AA'}{}^\mu D_\mu \phi^A = 0 , \quad (3.4)$$

$$e_{AA'}{}^\mu D_\mu \tilde{\phi}^{A'} = 0 . \quad (3.5)$$

Next, consider possible boundary conditions. It will again be simplest and most symmetrical to take local boundary conditions, as in the cases of $s = 0$ [5,6], $s = 1$ [8] and $s = 2$ [9]. By analogy with Sec.6 of [8] and Sec.10 of [9], define, at the boundaries Σ_I and Σ_F :

$$\Phi_\epsilon^A(x) = \epsilon \sqrt{2} n^A{}_{A'} \tilde{\phi}^{A'}(x) + \phi^A(x) , \quad (3.6)$$

where $\epsilon = \pm 1$ and $n^{AA'}$ is the spinor version of the unit time-like future-directed vector n^μ , normal to the surface Σ_I or Σ_F . If one regards the right-hand side of Eq.(3.6) as being given by a 4×4 matrix operator P_ϵ , acting on a column vector with components $(\phi^0, \phi^1, \tilde{\phi}^{0'}, \tilde{\phi}^{1'})$, one finds that P_+ and P_- are projection operators, obeying

$$P_+ + P_- = 1, \quad P_+ P_- = P_- P_+ = 0, \quad (P_\epsilon)^2 = P_\epsilon. \quad (3.7)$$

The use of such local boundary conditions is suggested by the work of [24-26]. Given a choice of ϵ , take the boundary contribution $S_{\frac{1}{2}B}$ to the action (3.1) to be

$$S_{\frac{1}{2}B} = \frac{i\epsilon}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} d^3x \, h^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_\epsilon^B \phi^A \epsilon_{AB}, \quad (3.8)$$

where $h = \det(h_{ij})$ and h_{ij} gives the intrinsic 3-metric of the boundary ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$), while ϵ_{AB} is the alternating spinor [22]. One can then verify that the total action $S_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is extremised at a classical solution, given a specification of Φ_ϵ^B at the boundary. These are our local boundary conditions. Note their similarity to the spin-1 (Maxwell) boundary conditions, involving the data $\Psi_+^{AB} = -2i n_{B'}^B e^{AB'k} B_k$ on Σ_I and Σ_F in Eq.(6.18) of [8], which correspond to fixing the (spatial) magnetic-field components B_k . Again, for spin-2 (gravitational-wave) perturbations, the boundary conditions correspond to fixing a projection of the Weyl tensor – see Sec.10 of [9].

At a classical solution, by virtue of the Weyl equations (3.4,5), the volume integral vanishes in Eq.(3.1) for the action $S_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence, the classical spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ part of the action resides on the boundary and, at lowest (quadratic) order in fermions, is given by

$$(S_{\frac{1}{2}})_{\text{class}} = (S_{\frac{1}{2}B})_{\text{class}}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $S_{\frac{1}{2}B}$ is given in Eq.(3.8).

For integer-spin perturbations, as in [5,6,8,9], we chose vanishing perturbative initial data on the initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I , to simplify the exposition. Correspondingly, for massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ perturbations, we take the homogeneous (Dirichlet-type) boundary conditions at Σ_I to be

$$\Psi_-^A(x) \Big|_{\Sigma_I} = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

(choosing $\epsilon = -1$ here). Equivalently,

$$\phi^A = \sqrt{2} \, n_{A'}^A \tilde{\phi}^{A'} \quad (3.11)$$

on Σ_I . Hence, there is no contribution to the classical action from the initial surface. On the final hypersurface Σ_F , we specify (non-zero) data $\Psi_+^A(x)$, corresponding to the presence of a remnant flux of neutrinos outgoing at large radius and late time:

$$\Psi_+^A(x) \Big|_{\Sigma_F} = f^A(r, \Omega). \quad (3.12)$$

In this case, unless one has found a complete solution of the field equations, Ψ_-^A is (as yet) unknown on Σ_F , while Ψ_+^A is unknown on Σ_I .

Following the discussion in Sec.2, the particular choice (3.10), with zero right-hand side, would be interpreted as containing no particles on Σ_I . But the choice (3.12) of final data, for $f^A \neq 0$, specifies that a certain amount of fermions were produced, to arrive at Σ_F . Of course, one can specify the right-hand sides of Eqs.(3.10,12) at will (subject to fall-off at infinity) to investigate the effects of allowing incoming fermions on Σ_I and asking how they contribute to the final fermionic output at Σ_F . Because the classical fermionic action in Eq.(4.35) below is 'bosonic' – that is, it is analogous to the particular wave function $f(a^*, a) = f_{11} aa^*$ in Eq.(2.2) – fermions can only be produced or destroyed in pairs. For example, from Eq.(4.35) it is impossible to have precisely one neutrino in the far future if none were present in the far past.

In our case, fermionic boundary data are to be specified on a pair of asymptotically-flat space-like hypersurfaces Σ_I and Σ_F , together with the boundary data, which include the asymptotic proper-time interval T , as measured at spatial infinity. It turns out [11] that one should then specify Ψ_-^A on one surface and Ψ_+^A on the other, to have a well-posed classical problem. In the 'cosmological' case, where, for example, a three-sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$ bounds a four-ball $\mathbb{B}^4$, different considerations may apply [11,29-31].

4. Summary of the Vaidya approximation

By analogy with the $s = 0$ case in [1-7], we now study weak $s = \frac{1}{2}$ massless (neutrino) fields in a spherically-symmetric 'background' Lorentzian-signature geometry

$$ds^2 = - e^{b(t,r)} dt^2 + e^{a(t,r)} dr^2 + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \quad , \quad (4.1)$$

along the lines described in [1,2]. We are principally interested in quantum emission of a roughly stochastic type, following gravitational collapse to a black hole, since generically this leads to the most probable final configurations. At late times, as described further in [1-9], the configuration of all fields (not just the 'background' spherically-symmetric coupled solution of the Einstein/massless-scalar field equations, but also the averaged second-variation energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ generated by the anisotropic perturbative fields) will approximate closely a nearly-spherically-symmetric stream of radially-outgoing null or massless radiation, together with the gravitational field which this generates. This is treated in detail in [3,4]. Here, we summarise briefly the necessary properties of such an approximately Vaidya metric [7,27]. In the companion paper [4] on spins 1 and 2, a full description of the aspects of the Vaidya solution relevant to the present spin-1/2 case is given. In [7], moreover, a detailed treatment of the Vaidya metric, as needed for the general question of black-hole evaporation, can be found. In addition to treatment of the Vaidya-like geometry in which the particles or fields propagate, [7] also includes a thorough description of the energy-momentum source for the Vaidya-like geometry, produced by a large number of null (radiating) particles.

As in [1-9], we write $e^{-a(t,r)}$ in terms of the 'mass function' $m(t, r)$ as

$$e^{-a(t,r)} = 1 - \frac{2m(t, r)}{r} \quad . \quad (4.2)$$

A Vaidya metric [7,27] corresponds to a spherically-symmetric null-fluid energy-momentum source, of the form

$$T_{\mu\nu} = f(t, r) k_\mu k_\nu \quad . \quad (4.3)$$

Here, $f(t, r)$ is some spherically-symmetric function, and the vector field k^μ is null ($k^\mu k_\mu = 0$) and points radially outward to the future (in our case). As is described much more fully in the companion paper [4], the corresponding Vaidya solution of the Einstein field equations with the energy-momentum source (4.3) can be put in the diagonal form (4.1), as

$$ds^2 = - \left(\frac{\dot{m}}{m'} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2m(t, r)}{r} \right)^{-1} dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2m(t, r)}{r} \right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2 \quad . \quad (4.4)$$

Here, $m = m(t, r)$, and $\dot{m}$, m' denote $\partial m / \partial t$, $\partial m / \partial r$, respectively. Thus,

$$e^{b(t, r)} = \left(\frac{\dot{m}}{m'} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r} \right)^{-1} \quad . \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover, as seen in [4,7], the Einstein field equations imply that

$$m' \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r} \right) = f(m) \quad , \quad (4.6)$$

where $f(m) \geq 0$ is an arbitrary (smooth) function. Physically, in our example, the function $f(m)$ in Eq.(4.6) depends on the specific physical (particle) model. This metric describes the space-time region in which radiation is streaming radially outwards, due to the black-hole evaporation. Correspondingly, the 'mass function' $m(t, r)$ varies extremely slowly with time, and effectively one has a Schwarzschild metric with a very slowly-varying mass, in which $f(m)$ can be regarded as nearly constant. As described in the preceding paper [4], the geometry will gradually deviate from the Vaidya form as one moves to the past into the strongly dynamical collapse region. Provided that the complexified classical boundary-value problem is well-posed, the complexified classical solution $(g_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ will be regular at every point, including the spatial origin $r = 0$.

As further described in [4,7], a coordinate transformation can be found, which leads to the usual form

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2m(u)}{r} \right) du^2 - 2 du dr + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \quad , \quad (4.7)$$

of the Vaidya metric [7,27], where $m = m(u)$ is now seen to be a function of a single null variable u . The diagonal form (4.4) will be used below, in studying the evolution of linearised perturbation fields on the slowly-varying sequence of Schwarzschild geometries which is described closely here by a Vaidya metric. The 'null' form (4.7) is instead useful in understanding the large-scale structure of the Vaidya space-time.

From the Vaidya metric in the form (4.7), one can see that the apparent singularity in the metric (4.4) at $r = 2m(u)$ is only a coordinate singularity [27]. Further, the surface $\{r = 2m(u)\}$ is space-like, lying to the past of the region $\{r > 2m(u)\}$. In fact, the geometry in the region $\{r < 2m(u)\}$ will gradually deviate from the Vaidya form, as one moves to the past by (say) reducing u while holding r fixed, since one reaches the region of strong-field gravitational collapse. This region can still be described by the diagonal metric (4.1), with scalar field $\phi = \phi(t, r)$, but the full field equations enforce a more complicated coupled solution. Again, provided that the complexified boundary-value problem of Sec.1 remains well-posed for $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$, the full, complexified Einstein/scalar classical solution studied here will be regular at the spatial origin $r = 0$.

5. Separation of neutrino equations

Separation of variables for the neutrino equation in a Kerr background space-time was carried out by Teukolsky [32] and by Unruh [33], using the Newman-Penrose formalism [34]. As in [5,6] for $s = 0$, [8] for $s = 1$ and [9] for $s = 2$, we are principally concerned here with the wave-like (Lorentzian) evolution of neutrino fields in the Vaidya-like metric [7,27], which describes the extremely slow evolution of the black hole, as it gradually loses mass through nearly-isotropic radiation. For most radiation frequencies of interest, the time rate of change of the background geometry will be so slow as to be negligible. Thus, the evolution of the wave will be adiabatic.

Following [32,33], we decompose the neutrino field $(\phi^A, \tilde{\phi}^{A'})$ with respect to the normalised spinor dyad (ι^A, o^A) which corresponds to the Kinnersley null tetrad [35] in the Schwarzschild metric. This pair (o^A, ι^A) gives a basis for the 2-complex-dimensional vector space of spinors ω^A at each point, and is normalised according to $o_A \iota^A = 1 = -\iota_A o^A$. Knowledge of the Kinnersley null tetrad [34,35] $\ell^\mu, n^\mu, m^\mu, \bar{m}^\mu$ of vectors at a point is equivalent to knowledge of the corresponding normalised spinor dyad (o^A, ι^A) , through the relations $\ell^\mu \leftrightarrow o^A o^{A'}, n^\mu \leftrightarrow \iota^A \iota^{A'}, m^\mu \leftrightarrow o^A \iota^{A'}, \bar{m}^\mu \leftrightarrow \iota^A o^{A'}$.

Writing $\phi^A = \chi^{(0)} o^A + \chi^{(1)} \iota^A$, one obtains the dyad version of the field equation $e_{AA'}{}^\mu D_\mu \phi^A = 0$:

$$\frac{1}{r\sqrt{2}} \left(\partial_\theta + \frac{i}{\sin \theta} \partial_\phi + \frac{1}{2} \cot \theta \right) \chi^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_t - e^{-a} \partial_r - \frac{(r-m)}{r^2} \right) \chi^{(1)} = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\left(e^a \partial_t + \partial_r + \frac{1}{r} \right) \chi^{(0)} + \frac{1}{r\sqrt{2}} \left(\partial_\theta + \frac{i}{\sin \theta} \partial_\phi + \frac{1}{2} \cot \theta \right) \chi^{(1)} = 0. \quad (5.2)$$

As is standard, one can separate variables in Eqs.(5.1,2). We write

$$\chi^{(0)}(t, r, \theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\ell=\frac{1}{2}}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-1}^{\ell} S_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(\theta) e^{im\phi} R_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) \quad , \quad (5.3)$$

$$\chi^{(1)}(t, r, \theta, \phi) = \sum_{\ell=\frac{1}{2}}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-1}^{\ell} S_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(\theta) e^{im\phi} R_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) \quad , \quad (5.4)$$

From Eqs.(5.3,4), $S_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(\theta, \phi)$ and $R_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(\theta, \phi)$ satisfy:

$$\frac{1}{2} r^2 \left(\partial_t - e^{-a} \partial_r - \frac{(r-M)}{r^2} \right) R_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m} = -\lambda_1 R_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m} , \quad (5.5)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\partial_\theta - \frac{m}{\sin \theta} + \frac{1}{2} \cot \theta \right) S_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m} = \lambda_1 S_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m} , \quad (5.6)$$

$$(e^a \partial_t + \partial_r) R_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m} = -\lambda_2 R_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m} , \quad (5.7)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\partial_\theta + \frac{m}{\sin \theta} + \frac{1}{2} \cot \theta \right) S_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m} = -\lambda_2 S_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m} , \quad (5.8)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are separation constants. Regularity of the angular functions $S_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\ell m}$ at $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$ implies that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_\ell$, say. That is, if we set $\theta' = (\pi - \theta)$ in Eq.(5.6,8), we find that $S_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(\theta) \propto S_{\mp\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(\pi - \theta)$. Up to normalisation, the functions $S_{\pm\frac{1}{2}\ell m} e^{im\phi}$ are just spin-weighted spherical harmonics ${}_s Y_{\ell m}(\Omega)$ for $s = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ [36,37]. These functions have the properties

$${}_s Y_{\ell m}^* = (-1)^{m+s} {}_{-s} Y_{\ell, -m} , \quad (5.9)$$

$${}_s Y_{\ell m}(\pi - \theta, \pi + \phi) = {}_s Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi) , \quad (5.10)$$

$$\int d\Omega {}_s Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) {}_s Y_{\ell' m'}^*(\Omega) = \delta_{\ell\ell'} \delta_{mm'} . \quad (5.11)$$

In general, the $S_{s\ell m}$, which are regular on $[0, \pi]$, satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \frac{d}{d\theta} \left(\sin \theta \frac{dS_{s\ell m}}{d\theta} \right) \\ + \left(\frac{-m^2}{\sin^2 \theta} - \frac{2ms \cot \theta}{\sin \theta} - s^2 \cot^2 \theta + s + \nu \right) S_{s\ell m} = 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

where $\nu = (\ell - s)(\ell + s + 1)$. For our case $|s| = \frac{1}{2}$, one has $\nu = 2(\lambda_\ell)^2 = (\ell + \frac{1}{2})^2$.

Finally, we make a further change of variables to

$$P_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-a/2} R_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) , \quad (5.13)$$

$$P_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) = R_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) , \quad (5.14)$$

and then to

$$P_{-\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\ell + \frac{1}{2}}} \left(\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m+}(t, r) - \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-}(t, r) \right) , \quad (5.15)$$

$$P_{+\frac{1}{2}\ell m}(t, r) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\ell + \frac{1}{2}}} \left(\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m+}(t, r) + \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-}(t, r) \right) . \quad (5.16)$$

We obtain the more symmetrical set of equations

$$\left(e^{-a} \partial_r + \frac{\lambda_\ell \sqrt{2}}{r} e^{-a/2} \right) \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-} = \partial_t \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m+} \quad , \quad (5.17)$$

$$\left(e^{-a} \partial_r - \frac{\lambda_\ell \sqrt{2}}{r} e^{-a/2} \right) \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m+} = \partial_t \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-} \quad . \quad (5.18)$$

These yield the second-order decoupled (t, r) form of the neutrino wave equation

$$e^{-a} \partial_r (e^{-a} \partial_r \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m\pm}) - (\partial_t)^2 \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m\pm} - V_{\frac{1}{2}\ell\pm} \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m\pm} = 0 \quad , \quad (5.19)$$

where the real potential(s) $V_{\frac{1}{2}\ell\pm}$ are given by

$$V_{\frac{1}{2}\ell\pm} = e^{-a} \left(\frac{2(\lambda_\ell)^2}{r^2} \pm \lambda_\ell \sqrt{2} \partial_r \left(\frac{e^{-a/2}}{r} \right) \right) \quad . \quad (5.20)$$

Thus, we have expressed the perturbative neutrino field in terms of 'odd' and 'even', or 'magnetic' and 'electric' components $\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m\pm}$, just as we did with the integer-spin perturbations. One can now use the Kinnersley tetrad

$$\begin{aligned} \ell^\mu &= \left(1/\left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right), 1, 0, 0 \right) \quad , \\ n^\mu &= \left(1, -\left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right), 0, 0 \right)/2 \quad , \\ m^\mu &= \left(0, 0, 1, (i/\sin\theta) \right)/r\sqrt{2} \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

in the Schwarzschild metrics together with the boundary condition (3.10), to write the classical action (3.8,9) as

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{\frac{1}{2}B})_{\text{class}} &= \frac{i}{2} \int d\Omega \int_0^{R\infty} dr \, r^2 e^{a/2} \left(\Psi_+^B o_B \chi^{(0)} + \Psi_+^B \iota_B \chi^{(1)} \right) \Big|_{\Sigma_F} \\ &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\ell=\frac{1}{2}}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-1}^{\ell} \frac{(\ell - \frac{1}{2})!}{(\ell + \frac{1}{2})!} \int_0^{R\infty} dr \, e^a \tilde{\xi}_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-} \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-} \Big|_T \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Here we have also used Eqs.(5.9,11,15,16).

The boundary condition (3.10) translates into

$$\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m+} \Big|_{t=0} = 0 \quad . \quad (5.23)$$

From Eq.(5.21), one finds

$$\left(\partial_t \xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-} \right) \Big|_{t=0} = 0 \quad . \quad (5.24)$$

In addition, one has

$$\Psi_+^A o_A = \chi^{(1)} + \sqrt{2} e^{a/2} \tilde{\chi}^{(0')} = \frac{\sqrt{2} e^{a/2}}{r} \sum_{\ell m} {}_{+\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) \frac{\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-}(t, r)}{\sqrt{\ell + \frac{1}{2}}} \quad , (5.25)$$

$$\Psi_+^A \iota_A = \frac{e^{-a/2}}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{\chi}^{(1')} - \chi^{(0)} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\ell m} {}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) \frac{\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-}(t, r)}{\sqrt{\ell + \frac{1}{2}}} \quad . (5.26)$$

Accordingly, we set

$$\xi_{\frac{1}{2}\ell m-}(t, r) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \, c_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell m-} \xi_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) \frac{\cos(kt)}{\cos(kT)} \quad , (5.27)$$

where the $\{c_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell m-}\}$ are certain coefficients taking (odd) values in a Grassmann algebra, and the $\{\xi_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r)\}$ are radial functions. As above, we have assumed that, in a neighbourhood of Σ_F , an adiabatic approximation is valid, such that the frequencies are large when compared with the inverse time-scale for the very slow change in the background metric.

From Eqs.(5.17-19), regularity near the centre of symmetry $\{r = 0\}$ demands that

$$\xi_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) \sim \mu_{k\ell\epsilon} r j_{\ell-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon}(kr) \quad , (5.28)$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$, where $j_{\ell-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon}(kr)$ denotes a spherical Bessel function [38], and $\mu_{k\ell\epsilon}$ is a normalisation constant. Hence, the $\{\xi_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r)\}$ are real functions.

Noting the (t, r) neutrino field equation (5.19), we set

$$\xi_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) = \left((z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}) e^{ikr^*} + (z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}^*) e^{-ikr^*} \right) f_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) \quad , (5.29)$$

where the $z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}$ are complex coefficients, and we take the boundary condition at infinity to be $f_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) \rightarrow 1$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, so that $\xi_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) \sim \left((z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}) e^{ikr^*} + (z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}^*) e^{-ikr^*} \right)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Here, r^* is a generalised Regge-Wheeler coordinate [39,40], such that

$$\frac{dr^*}{dr} = e^{(a-b)/2} \quad , (5.30)$$

and one also has $f_{\frac{1}{2},-k\ell-}(r) = f_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r)$. The coefficients $z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}$ satisfy $z_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}^* = z_{\frac{1}{2},-k\ell-}$. The normalisation of the radial functions is given by

$$\int_0^{R\infty} dr \, e^a \tilde{\xi}_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-}(r) \xi_{\frac{1}{2}k'\ell-}(r) = 2\pi \tilde{z}_{\frac{1}{2}k\ell-} z_{\frac{1}{2}k'\ell-} \left(\delta(k, k') + \delta(k, -k') \right) \quad . (5.31)$$

Hence, the classical spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ action (5.22) can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{\frac{1}{2}B})_{\text{class}} &= -i\pi\sqrt{2} \sum_{\ell=\frac{1}{2}}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-\ell}^{\ell} \frac{(\ell - \frac{1}{2})!}{(\ell + \frac{1}{2})!} \times \\ &\times \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \, \tilde{z}_{\frac{1}{2}\omega\ell-} z_{\frac{1}{2}\omega\ell-} \left(\left(\tilde{c}_{\frac{1}{2}\omega\ell m-} \right) + \left(\tilde{c}_{\frac{1}{2}-\omega\ell m-} \right) \right) \left(\left(c_{\frac{1}{2}\omega\ell m-} \right) + \left(c_{\frac{1}{2}-\omega\ell m-} \right) \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

This is the desired form of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ classical action, providing the nearest correspondence with the bosonic expressions Eq.(3.8) of [6], Eq.(5.19) of [10] and Eq.(9.7) of [9] for spins $s = 0, 1$ and 2 , respectively. When one compares this with the massless-scalar (second-variation) action S_{class} in Eq.(3.8) of [6], the $s = 0$ expression involves an integral $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk k ()$, whereas for $s = \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\int_0^{\infty} d\omega ()$, with no power of ω . The $s = 0$ integrand is schematically of the form $\tilde{z} z \tilde{a} a$, whereas for $s = \frac{1}{2}$ one has $\tilde{z} z \tilde{c} c$, where the tildes refer to the primed spinor field $\tilde{\phi}^{A'}$, and untilded quantities refer to the unprimed field ϕ^A ; this structure is inevitable in massless fermionic theories. Finally, the $s = 0$ integrand includes a factor $\cot(kT)$, which was crucial in determining the form of the $s = 0$ quantum amplitude in [6], *via* rotation of T into the complex. In the $s = \frac{1}{2}$ case, this factor of $\cot(kT)$ is absent, and the calculation of the $s = \frac{1}{2}$ quantum amplitude is correspondingly simpler.

6. Conclusion

We have seen in this paper how the calculations in [5-9], treating quantum amplitudes for the emission of bosonic particles ($s = 0, 1, 2$), in a nearly-spherically-symmetric Einstein/massless-scalar collapse to a black hole, can be extended to the fermionic case of a massless spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ neutrino field. Following the treatment in [1-3,5-7] of the $s = 0$ massless-scalar case, the classical action functional for $s = \frac{1}{2}$ data on the final late-time space-like hypersurface Σ_F has been calculated. One again takes the initial Einstein/scalar data on Σ_I to be exactly spherically symmetric, describing (say) diffuse, slowly-moving initial data for gravitational collapse to a black hole. We assume that the (real) Lorentzian proper-time separation T between Σ_I and Σ_F , as measured at spatial infinity, is sufficiently large that Σ_F intersects all the radiation emitted. Moreover, the final data consist of a section of a spherically-symmetric approximately Vaidya geometry, together with weak spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ data. We rotate $T \rightarrow |T| \exp(-i\theta)$ into the lower-half complex- T plane ($0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$), after Feynman. We expect that the classical boundary-value problem will then be well-posed. The classical action has here been calculated as a functional of the (suitably chosen) boundary data, leading to the quantum amplitude.

Perhaps the main differences between the bosonic calculations and the present fermionic calculation are that, classically, the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ field is described by odd (anti-commuting) Grassmann quantities, and, of course, that the field equations are of first order, unlike the commuting and second-order nature of the bosonic systems. The first-order property for spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ is reflected in our choice of local boundary conditions, 'inherited' from local supersymmetry [24-26,41,42]. This 'ancestral' appearance of supergravity is reflected in the form of the classical action functional of the corresponding 'local' boundary data, as well as in the resulting quantum amplitude. An analogous (but more complicated) treatment of amplitudes for the spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ field, crucial for local supersymmetry (supergravity) will soon be completed [43].

As remarked in [2], the present approach leads to a calculation of quantum amplitudes, appropriate for studying the black-hole radiation which follows gravitational collapse. This formulation must be different from the familiar one (which is normally carried out by considering Bogoliubov transformations), since it yields quantum amplitudes relating to the final state, and not just the usual probabilities for outcomes at a late time and large

radius. It is not that many of the attributes of the radiation, whether described in the present way or in the usual way, can be very different in the two descriptions. It is rather that the present description allows one to ask more questions of the radiation (and to receive a response).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the referee for questions and suggestions which led to substantial improvements in the paper.

References

- [1] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, Phys Lett. B **601**, 184 (2004).
- [2] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, Phys Lett. B **613**, 181 (2005).
- [3] A.N.St.J.Farley, 'Quantum Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation, approved 2002 (unpublished).
- [4] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, Class. Quantum Grav. **22**, 2765 (2005).
- [5] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Quantum Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation: I. Complex Approach', submitted for publication (2005).
- [6] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Quantum Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation: II. Spin-0 Amplitude', submitted for publication (2005).
- [7] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Vaidya Space-Time in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [8] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Spin-1 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [9] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Spin-2 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [10] P.R.Garabedian, *Partial Differential Equations*, (Wiley, New York) (1964).
- [11] P.D.D'Eath, *Supersymmetric Quantum Cosmology*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1996).
- [12] R.P.Feynman and A.R.Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*, (McGraw-Hill, New York) (1965).
- [13] W.McLean, *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (2000); O.Reula, 'A configuration space for quantum gravity and solutions to the Euclidean Einstein equations in a slab region', Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, **MPA**, 275 (1987).
- [14] J.Wess and J.Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, 2nd. edition, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.) (1992).
- [15] P.D.D'Eath, 'What local supersymmetry can do for quantum cosmology', in *The Future of Theoretical Physics and Cosmology*, eds. G.W.Gibbons, E.P.S.Shellard and S.J.Rankin (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 693 (2003).
- [16] P.D.D'Eath, 'Loop amplitudes in supergravity by canonical quantization', in *Fundamental Problems in Classical, Quantum and String Gravity*, ed. N. Sánchez (Observatoire de Paris) **166** (1999), hep-th/9807028.
- [17] A.Das, M.Fischler and M. Roček, Phys. Lett. B **69**, 186 (1977).
- [18] L.D.Faddeev, in *Methods in Field Theory*, ed. R.Balian and J.Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam) (1976).

- [19] L.D.Faddeev and A.A.Slavnov, *Gauge Fields: Introduction to Quantum Theory* (Benjamin/Cummings, Reading, Mass.) (1980).
- [20] C.Itzykson and J.-B.Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, (McGraw-Hill, New York) (1980).
- [21] D.Bao, Y.Choquet-Bruhat, J.Isenberg and P.B.Yasskin, J. Math. Phys. **26**, 329 (1985).
- [22] R.Penrose and W.Rindler, *Spinors and Space-Time*, vol. 1 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1984).
- [23] R.Penrose and W.Rindler, *Spinors and Space-Time*, vol. 2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1986).
- [24] P.Breitenlohner and D.Z.Freedman, Phys. Lett. B **115**, 197 (1982).
- [25] P.Breitenlohner and D.Z.Freedman, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **144**, 249 (1982).
- [26] S.W.Hawking, Phys. Lett. B **126**, 175 (1983).
- [27] P.C.Vaidya, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. **A33**, 264 (1951); R.W.Lindquist, R.A.Schwartz and C.W. Misner, Phys. Rev. **137**, 1364 (1965).
- [28] F.A.Berezin, *The Method of Second Quantization*, (Academic, New York) (1966).
- [29] P.D.D'Eath and G.V.M.Esposito, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 3234 (1991).
- [30] P.D.D'Eath and G.V.M.Esposito, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 1713 (1991).
- [31] M.F.Atiyah, V.K.Patodi and I.M.Singer, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **77**, 43 (1975).
- [32] S.A.Teukolsky, Astrophys. J. **185**, 635 (1973).
- [33] W.G.Unruh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 1265 (1973).
- [34] E.T.Newman and R.Penrose, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 566 (1962).
- [35] W.Kinnersley, J. Math. Phys **10**, 1195 (1969).
- [36] J.N.Goldberg, A.J.MacFarlane, E.T.Newman, F.Rohrlich and E.C.G.Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **8**, 2155 (1967).
- [37] J.A.H.Futterman, F.A.Handler and R.A.Matzner, *Scattering from Black Holes*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1988).
- [38] M.Abramowitz and I.A.Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, (Dover, New York) (1964).
- [39] T.Regge and J.A.Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1063 (1957).
- [40] C.W.Misner, K.S.Thorne and J.A.Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (Freeman, San Francisco) (1973).
- [41] G.V.M.Esposito, *Quantum Gravity, Quantum Cosmology and Lorentzian Geometries*, Lecture Notes in Physics m12 (Springer, Berlin) (1994).
- [42] G.V.M.Esposito, *Dirac Operators and Spectral Geometry*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1998).
- [43] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Spin-3/2 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', in progress.